



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

previous editions, with one of the doors in the front omitted and each of the four altars in the great court supplied with a door and a lintel and thus converted into four great portals! There is another altar in the central court, but Maspero still persists in calling the structure a dwelling, though no one ever heard of an Egyptian dwelling with five altars, or any altar at all.

In the account of the ancient canals, it is rather surprising not to find the canal around the first cataract mentioned. The canal itself to be sure has not yet been located, but we are morally certain of its existence from the inscription discovered by Mr. Wilbur on the Island of Sehel. In the same connection Maspero repeats his conviction that Lake Moeris was a myth. In the very convincing results of Mr. Petrie's investigations do not appeal to Maspero, no one can object, but it is hardly just to the student that he should not be made acquainted at least with the fact of their existence, in a three line footnote. In this connection we may also add, that the book would be far more useful as a text-book, if footnotes had been added informing the student as to the sources of the numerous illustrations, just as Maspero has so carefully done in his "Dawn of Civilization."

In his account of the sphinx, Maspero follows the traditional belief in its great age and makes it possibly prehistoric. Everyone knows there is a IVth Dynasty mummy shaft cut down through the back, which must certainly have been there before the statue was hewn. This and the above are a few out of numerous examples in the work, of an inclination to settle debated questions by a mere *ipse dixit*.

With the above exceptions the book has been very well brought up to date. Notwithstanding the added material and ten new illustrations, the form of the work has been so well compressed by the publishers, without altering the size of the page, that it is much less bulky than the previous editions, a fact which will be appreciated by the tourist.

At least for the account of the sculpture, the publishers should have used new plates, for the illustrations in this section are hopelessly bad. The magnificent statue of Khafre' (p. 218) has been transformed into cross-eyed hideousness which mocks the encomiums of Maspero in the text. New plates would greatly have improved the work throughout.

J. H. B.

---

**The Song of Solomon and the Lamentations of Jeremiah** (Expositor's Bible),

By WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, and Church History, New College, London. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1895. Pages viii + 346. Price, \$1.50.

No book of the Bible has been a mine for such a variety of miners and mining-products as the Song of Solomon. From Origen to Spurgeon interpreters have painted a halo about its form, until it has entirely hidden the original body. If the methods which have been applied to the Song of

Solomon were legitimate for any and every other book of the Old or New Testaments, there is nothing either good or bad which could not be proved to be the opposite. Origenistic, and allegorical principles of interpretation have been the base of Scripture exegesis in the past, and their poison is not yet fully driven out of the blood of biblical students. But Professor Adeney has been iconoclastic enough to break through the temple which has hidden our book, and examine the thing itself. The A.V. countenances and indorses those old errors in the mischievous headings of its eight chapters, but the R.V., as the original, does not feed the reader on such stale and hurtful food.

Is the poem a unit? If so, its movement is jerky and hitchy. Its turns and breaks are sudden and unexpected. This has been explained by some writers on the ground of its being but a disconnected lot of independent lyrics. Unsatisfactory indeed is such a cutting of the knot, instead of patiently untying it. The poem is dressed throughout in the same rich, luxurious language, the same unique imagery, and casts the same glow of light. A careful examination of the plot reveals a surprising unity. Then is it an idyl or a drama? Indo-European ideas of the drama cannot be the standard for the measurement of Semitic productions. To call it a drama, necessarily makes it *sui generis*. Two classes of interpreters present plausible schemes of interpretation. (1) Solomon is the only lover, (2) the king is seeking to win the affections of the country maiden, "but is forestalled by a shepherd, fidelity to whom is shown by the Shulammite in spite of the fascinations of the court" (p. 6). The former of these schemes is the less probable, while the latter can be sufficiently adjusted to all the requirements of the poem. The chief element in the poem which challenges the attention of the reader is not love, but fidelity, constancy as seen in the maiden absent from her rustic lover. This simple girl, proof against all the fascinations of the most splendid cant, who prefers to be the wife of the poor man whom she loves, and to whom she has plighted troth, to accepting a queen's crown at the cost of deserting her humble lover, is the type and example of a loyalty which is the more admirable because it appears where we should little expect to find it (p. 10).

Who wrote the book? Not Solomon, as he illustrates in every phase of his life the exact opposite of the truths of this poem. Professor Adeney decides that its style, contents, picturesqueness—all locate its time of composition within a half century after the death of the king whose name it bears (p. 13). In the exposition proper, the author gives a perfectly natural and sensible interpretation of the poem, such as will strike the approval of every all-around Bible student.

Of the 346 pages of this volume, 284 are devoted to an elaborate discussion and exposition of Lamentations. After a *pro* and *con* treatment of Jeremiah's authorship, the writer concludes that the book originated "at

some time during the second half of the sixth century," B.C. (p. 85 f.). It is certainly stamped with the vividness of an eyewitness. With a careful knowledge of those times, and of illustrative literature, Professor Adeney has constructed twenty-four telling discourses. PRICE.

---

**The Book of Jeremiah, Chapters 21-52.** By W. H. BENNETT, Professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature Hackney and New Colleges. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1895. Pp. xx.+372. In the *Expositor's Bible*.

The former volume on Jeremiah, published in 1890, covering chaps. 1-20, was prepared by C. J. Ball. Professor Bennett is the author of the volume on the books of Chronicles which appeared in 1894. In Jeremiah, the chronological order of the prophecies is a question of great importance. In the book before us this problem is met by a table giving the principal dates and events of the period, with the chapters of Jeremiah's prophecy belonging to each. In this table the author is in general accord with the scholarship of the present day.

The exposition is in general sound and sensible. The historical situation in its changes is well portrayed. For popular impression, comparison with similar historical scenes and recent history is often made, although these are sometimes inadequate. The author occasionally resorts to conjecture where historical data are wanting. There is no manifestation of an undue homiletical tendency. No attempt is made to present the details of exegesis, although the author shows evident familiarity with the best and most recent work in this line. Full recognition is made of the necessity, in many cases, of emending the text, chiefly on the basis of the versions.

The general plan of the book is fairly open to criticism. The first two of the three parts give the impression of containing more history than exposition. A better plan is that followed in Ball's Jeremiah, Farrar's Daniel, and others of this series, where a few opening chapters contain a preliminary sketch of the history and the following ones a larger amount of exposition. A more comprehensive treatment of the period would have been desirable, including to greater extent the other prophets of the period, and showing the relation of the period as a whole to prophecy preceding and following. The reason this is not given is probably that this ground was considered to be sufficiently covered in the preceding volume on Jeremiah.

The author's point of view is that of most modern students of prophecy. He emphasizes the conditional element in prophecy. He does not seek an exact fulfilment of the seventy years of the exile, nor of other minor details of prophecy. The human element in Jeremiah's work is granted, as seen especially in his discouragement and his almost vindictive threatenings. Yet the author also emphasizes the fact that much of the severity of his language and demeanor came from the truth which came to him by inspiration. It is a human prophet here set before us, but one speaking a divine message. Most moderately liberal scholars would agree with these conclusions.